SHORTER NOTES

The Validity of the Genus Paratheria Griseb.—In working over some material recently collected by Mr. A. H. Curtiss on the Isle of Pines, just to the south of Cuba, a peculiar grass was encountered which proved somewhat of a puzzle for a time. Investigation showed that it is *Paratheria prostrata* Griseb. (Cat. Pl. Cub. 236. 1866), a grass, which, so far as material at hand indicates, has been collected in Cuba but once — by Wright in the year 1865, the type of the genus. It must therefore be rare in herbaria, and its rediscovery by Mr. Curtiss is consequently of interest and value. The genus *Paratheria* is referred by Hackel to *Chamaeraphis*, and it appears also to have been considered in this light by Col. Munro, for Sauvalle (Fl. Cub. 200) has published a *Chamaeraphis parvigluma* Munro, a nomen subnudum, however; this is based upon Wright's no. 3909. I cannot find this number in our collections, but I do find a 3906 labeled as above, and I suspect therefore that the 3909 is a typographical error for 3906.

I cannot agree with the disposition of this genus made by both Hackel and Munro, and must consider it as distinct from *Chamaeraphis*, for reasons which will be given below. *Chamaeraphis* was based on an Australian grass which the author named *C. hordeacea*. At first sight, the superficial resemblance of the two genera is quite marked, but a study of the spikelets discloses differences which make it desirable to keep them apart. In *Chamaeraphis* the first two scales of the spikelet are empty, the first one very small, the second as long as the spikelet; the third scale encloses a staminate flower; the fourth scale, which is only about one half as long as the spikelet, contains a pistillate flower, but no stamens, so far as our material indicates; this is also in conformity with the original description of brown, the author of *Chamaeraphis*. In *Paratheria*, the first three scales are empty, the first and second very small, almost rudimentary, the third as long as the spikelet; while the fourth encloses a perfect flower. These differences in scale and floral structure, reinforced by the

wide divergence in geographic distribution, indicate rather clearly the necessity for keeping them separate.

George V. Nash.

New York Botanical Garden.

Sarracenia flava in Virginia. — Early on the morning of June 17, 1904, while coming up through Virginia on the Seaboard Air Line, I saw from the train, in Dinwiddie County, seven miles below Petersburg, a colony (containing probably several hundred individuals) of *Sarracenia flava*. As I was traveling at the rate of about a mile a minute, I did not have time to examine its habitat very closely, but the plants seemed to be growing in a sort of meadow, just as I have seen them in North Carolina, about forty miles farther south. (See Torreya, 3: 123, 124. August, 1903.) This locality is probably a few miles west of the fall-line, though this fact does not preclude the possibility of its being on some comparatively recent formation.

This seems to be the northernmost known station for *Sarracenia flava* (latitude 37° 8′). Although the species is credited to Virginia in most manuals of the Northern States (probably on the authority of Clayton and other pre-Linnaean botanists), I have seen no specimens from that state, and none are cited in Gray's Synoptical Flora or in Kearney's Dismal Swamp report. I have, however, just found a record of one other Virginia station for it. Prof. Lester F. Ward (Bot. Gaz. 11: 37, 38. February, 1886), mentions seeing specimens collected in the summer of 1885 by W J McGee in "a swamp in a pine wood, two miles north of Rowanty Creek" (presumably near the fall-line). From examination of a map it seems that my station must be a few miles northwest of his, near the head of the same creek.

That portion of the railroad on which I was traveling at the time above mentioned has been in operation only four or five years, and the country adjacent to it is probably little known to botanists, though I know of several who have already passed through it on trains.

Roland M. Harper.

College Point, N. Y.

An Undescribed Species of Alnus. — Some years ago I collected fruiting specimens of a large alder in swampy woods, along the edge of a brook on the coastal plain of Staten Island, near Grant City; these were at the time referred to *Alnus incana*, though with doubt, inasmuch as the height of the tree seemed much too great for that species, and the large, strongly-pointed leaves seemed also to be different from those of any specimens of *incana* that I had seen. The woods in which this tree grew were cut away soon after my collection was made, and, though a search was made in the vicinity for other plants, I was never able to find another specimen. I have been confident for a long time that it represented a species distinct from both the European *Alnus incana* and its American representative, *Alnus glauca* Michx., which I think very likely to be distinct from *incana*. Mr. Bicknell has found this summer shrubs with foliage evidently the same as my tree from Grant City, in similar situations in southeastern Long Island, so I now feel warranted in proposing this apparently local plant as an undescribed species.

Alnus Noveboracensis sp. nov.

A shrub or small tree, sometimes 8 m. tall, with a trunk 1 dm. thick. Young twigs and petioles densely pubescent; leaves oblong to obovate, acute at both ends, 12 cm. long or less, sharply irregularly serrate, very densely pubescent on the prominent veins beneath, otherwise glabrous or nearly so, dark green above, paler green but not at all glaucous on the under side; ripe pistillate aments numerous, oblong, 1.5 cm. long, very short-stalked; nut oval, about one half longer than wide, narrowly margined.

Woods and thickets near the coast, southeastern New York. Type from Grant City, Staten Island.

N. L. Britton.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CLUB

Tuesday, May 10, 1904.

This meeting was held in the library of the New York College of Pharmacy and 15 persons were present, Rev. L. H. Lighthipe presiding.